



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/509,074

10/14/2005

Genhui Chen

W453 0007/GSO

1249

720

7590

05/16/2008

OYEN, WIGGS, GREEN & MUTALA LLP

480 - THE STATION

601 WEST CORDOVA STREET

VANCOUVER, BC V6B 1G1

CANADA

EXAMINER

QAZI, SABIHA NAIM

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1612

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/16/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/509,074	CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sabiha Qazi	1612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1612

Non-Final Office Action

Claims 16-21 are pending. New claims are added. Amendments are entered. No claim is allowed at this time.

Summary of this Office Action dated May 10, 2008

1. Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114
2. 35 USC § 101 Rejection
3. 35 USC § 112 (1) Rejection
4. 35 USC § 112 (2) Rejection
5. 35 USC § 103(a) Rejection
6. Response to Remarks
7. Communication

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/2/2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because claimed invention is directed to nonstatutory subject matter. Claim 19 is drafted in terms of “use”, however “use” is not one of the statutory classes of invention. Clinical Products v. Brenner, 1449 USPQ 475, 476 (1966).

Claims Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 – First Paragraph Rejection

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 1612

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for leukemia, non-small cell lung cancer, colon cancer, CNS cancer, melanoma by compound 0058 (JS-38) in the specification, does not reasonable provide enablement for the **treating or preventing proliferative** diseases in a human or an animal comprising administration to the human or animal of a therapeutic amount of a compound of the formula wherein Z = aryl, heterocyclic, substituted or unsubstituted alkenyl, substituted or unsubstituted alkynyl group, while X and Y can be the same or different, are hydrogen, substituted or unsubstituted alkyl, cycloalkyl, aryl, aralkyl or heterocyclic group.

Examiner notes that amended claim 16 now contains specific compounds, however still contains large number of combination of substituents having different substituents at X, Y and Z. Specification does not contain any data or guidance for the **"medicament for the treatment of prophylaxis of proliferative diseases"** as has been claimed in claim 19. Furthermore, there is no guidance or teaching how and when human or an animal will be prevented.

The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in In re Colianni, 195 USPQ

Art Unit: 1612

150, 153 (CCPA 1977), have been clarified by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in Ex parte Forman, 230 USPQ 546 (BPAI 1986), and are summarized in In re Wands (858 F2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed Cir. 1988)). Among these factors are: (1) the nature of the invention; (2) the state of the prior art; (3) the relative skill of those in the art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the breadth of the claims; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

When the above factors are weighed, it is the examiner's position that one skilled in the art could not practice the invention without undue experimentation.

(1) The nature of the invention: The claims are drawn to a method of treating or preventing proliferative diseases in a human or an animal comprising administration to the human or animal of a therapeutic amount of a compound of the formula as in claim 16, wherein Z, X and Y can have variety of substituents containing heterocyclic and non-heterocyclic groups. Each has different chemical structure and expected to have different properties.

(2) The predictability or unpredictability of the art: There is lack of predictability in the in the pharmaceutical art especially in the methods for treatment or prevention of proliferative disease.

Evidence involving a single compound and two types of cancer was not found sufficient to establish the enablement of claims directed to a method of treating seven types

Art Unit: 1612

of cancer with members of a class of several compounds. In re Buting, 163 USPQ 689. The disclosure provides no indication of whether the compounds treat all cancers. To make clearer the lack of enablement for treatment of all cancer, extrinsic evidence is supplied by DRAETTA (Ann. Reports Med. Chem.), DRAETTA et al. in "Annual Reports in Medicinal Chemistry", 1996, Academic Press, San Diego, pp 241-246, final sentence on page 246 although many still think about the need for a magic bullet as a cure for all cancers, our knowledge of the molecular mechanism underlying this disease make the prospect of developing such a universal cure very unlikely." Since no universal cure for cancer has been developed, it follows that there is no correlation between the assays relied upon by applicants and the ability for the treatment and prophylaxis of proliferative diseases as has been claimed in claim 19. Thus, those assays are not sufficient to enable such claims.

Further, **in the art of clinical oncology, no compound has yet shown clinical efficacy against every type of cancer. Different agents are used for different forms of cancer and no single agent is listed as a treatment of every single type of cancer.** BALASUBRAMANIAN reference (Recent Developments in Cancer Cytotoxics) on page 151 first paragraph "the successful treatment of solid tumors remains a formidable challenge."

Applicant has provided no evidence, which incontrovertibly demonstrates that the tests set forth in the instant specification are art-recognized, reliable predictors of successful treatable, in vivo, of all cancers. The worker of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to practice the instantly claimed method, since no description is found of an actual method wherein a cancer in a host is treated. Applicants fail to fulfill the requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112,

Art Unit: 1612

first paragraph, by failing to provide an adequate written description of how to treat all cancers in a single host.

(3) The amount of direction or guidance presented: There is no guidance in the disclosure on how to use the invention successfully for the treatment or prophylaxis of any proliferative diseases as claimed.

In re Dreshfield, 110 F.2d 235, 45 USPQ 36 (CCPA 1940), gives this general rule: "It is well settled that in cases involving chemicals and chemical compounds, which differ radically in their properties it must appear in an applicant's specification either by the enumeration of a sufficient number of the members of a group or by other appropriate language, that the chemicals or chemical combinations included in the claims are capable of accomplishing the desired result."

The courts have further interpreted undue experimentation as requiring "ingenuity beyond that to be expected of one of ordinary skill in the art" (Fields v. Conover, 170 USPQ 276 (CCPA 1971)) or requiring an extended period of experimentation in the absence of sufficient direction or guidance (In re Colianni, 195 USPQ 150 (CCPA 1977)). Additionally, the courts have determined that "... where a statement is, on its face, contrary to generally accepted scientific principles", a rejection for failure to teach how to make and/or use is proper (In re Marzocchi, 169 USPQ 367 (CCPA 1971)).

(4) The presence or absence of working examples: A disclosure should contain representative examples, which provide reasonable assurance to one skilled in the art that the

Art Unit: 1612

compounds fall within the scope of a claim will possess the alleged activity. See *In re Riat et al.* (CCPA 1964) 327 F2d 685, 140 USPQ 471; *In re Barr et al.* (CCPA 1971) 444 F 2d 349, 151 USPQ 724.

(5) The quantity of experimentation necessary: Since there is no guidance presented in the disclosure, how to **treat or prevent “antiproliferative diseases”** successfully by claimed compounds, one skilled in the art at the time of invention would have to go through undue experimentation to make and/or use the presently claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Following reason apply:

3. Citation of “in association with” in claim 20 is unclear. Applicant may consider deleting this phrase.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1612

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 16-18, 20 and 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WEBSTER et al.¹ and GODFREY². Both the references teach dithiolopyrrolones and their derivatives as presently claimed.

¹ WO 99/12543

² GB 2,173,499

WEBSTER teaches dithiolpyrroles as antineoplastic agents. See the entire document especially abstract, figure 1 on page 1, figures 2 and 3 on page 2, examples and claims.

GODFREY teaches these compounds as fungicides. See the entire document especially compounds of formula (1) on page 1, Table 1 on page 3 continued to page 5 scheme 1 on page 7 examples and claims.

Instant claims are generically taught by the prior art.

Instant claims differ from the reference in that they are of different generic scope. It had been held by Courts that the indiscriminate selection of “some” from among “many” is considered prima facie obvious. In re Lemin, 141 USPQ 814 (1964); National Distillers and Chem. Corp. V. Brenner, 156 USPQ 163.

The instant claimed compounds would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated to prepare compounds embraced by the genus of the above cited references with the expectation of obtaining additional beneficial compounds. The instant claimed compounds would have been suggested to one skilled in the art.

One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the claimed compounds from the genus in the reference since such compounds would have been suggested by the reference as a whole. It has been held that a prior art disclosed genus of useful compounds is sufficient to render prima facie obvious a species falling within the genus. In re

Art Unit: 1612

Susi, 440 F.2d 442, 445, 169 USPQ 423, 425 (CCPA 1971), followed by the Federal Circuit in Merck & Co. V. Biocraft Laboratories, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ 2d 1843, 1846 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have obvious to one skilled in the art.

Response to the Remarks

Since claims are amended therefore rejection under 112 (1) paragraph is withdrawn. Applicants arguments were fully considered but are not found persuasive therefore obviousness rejection is maintained. Amended claim 16 is now drawn to specific compounds. In order to advance the prosecution Applicant may consider calling the Examiner to discuss the issues surrounding this application.

Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi whose telephone number is (571) 272-0622. The examiner can normally be reached on any business day except Wednesday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Krass Frederick can be reached on (571) 272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1612

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sabiha Qazi/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1612